REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 17-18 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a).

Claims 8-16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Scholl et al. in view of Vitera et al.

Claims 4 and 5 were indicated as allowable if amended to overcome the 37 CFR 1.75(a) objections.

Claims 2-4 and 10-12 are canceled herein.

Claims 1, 5, 8-9, 13, 17 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13-20 are herein presented for examination.

37 CFR 1.75(a) rejections over come

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the 37 CFR 1.75(a) rejection and is applicable to the related active dependent claims 5-8 and 17-18.

USC 112, second paragraph rejections have been overcome

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections and is applicable to the related active dependent claims.

Allowable limitations have been included in claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable limitations indicated by the Examiner of canceled claim 4, and to overcome canceled claim 4's 37 CFR 1.75(a) objection, therefore claims 1, 5-8, 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Allowable limitations have been included in claim 9

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 12, which are the essential structural elements of the method of canceled claim 4. While the Examiner has not directly indicated that claim 9 would be allowable based on these elements, neither the Examiner's Office Action nor the references applied by the Examiner (Scholl et al. and Viteri et al.) include the limitations of canceled claim 12, as explained below, therefore claim 9 amended in view of canceled claim 12's limitations, and the related dependant claims are allowable.

Specifically, canceled claim 12 included, inter alia, "... a waste-heat steam generator located downstream of the gas turbine and upstream of the first cooling stage adapted to generate process

steam for a steam turbine..."As disclosed at page 4, lines 29-36, and page 6, line 33 – page 7, line 2, the waste-heat steam generator of the instant invention provides high efficiency by using the heat contained in the exhaust gas of the turbine to generate process steam for the steam turbine.

In contrast, Scholl et al. teaches using a fossil fuel fired steam generator, see column 3, lines 59-62, to process steam for its steam turbine. Scholl et al.'s fossil fuel fired steam generator is less efficient and produces more carbon dioxide emissions than the instant invention because its steam generator is driven in part by fossil-fuel whereas the instant invention's steam turbine is driven solely by the steam of the waste-heat steam generator and does not include using fossil-fuel.

The essence of the instant invention is to minimize the amount of climatically harmful gasses such as nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxides which emanate from burning fossil fuels. The use of a single source of fossil fuel emissions (the combustion chamber) in the instant invention provides an appreciably more efficient and environmentally safer power generating system than the invention of Scholl et al. because Scholl et al. presents two sources of fossil fuel emissions (the oil/gas fired furnace and the fossil fuel fired steam generator – which drives its steam turbine).

Even combining the Viteri et al. reference with Scholl et al. fails to teach the instant invention because, while Viteri et al. includes a heat recovery steam generator which uses a steam turbine powered by a steam heating circuit similar to the instant inventions waste heat steam generator, Viteri et al. does not include a cooling stage down stream from the waste heat steam generator.

Viteri et al. uses only the heat recovery steam generator to cool the turbine exhaust gas, whereas as the instant invention includes "at least a first and second cooling stage" in addition to the cooling achieved via the waste-heat steam generator. The instant invention provides inherently more efficiency than Viteri et al. because it includes a set of additional cooling stages which are distinct from the cooling which occurs during waste heat steam generating. As disclosed in the Specification, see page 4, lines 23-26, this complementary multi-stage cooling allows a required temperature gradient to which the exhaust is subjected to be favorably set so that precipitation of the water can be optimized in terms of quantity and/or time. In sharp

contrast, Viteri et al. teaches it "... merely provides water traps at lowermost portions of the return duct 120 to collect any water condensing within the return duct 120 ...".

Note, where Viteri et al. teaches using an additional cooling stage down stream from the steam generation circuit (waste-heat steam generator), Viteri et al. expressly ***teaches away*** from using a steam generator, which includes the steam turbine, see column 17, lines 20-28.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing arguments and amendments. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/5/07

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830